

REMARKS

Claims 2-6 and 28 are pending for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claim 2 has been amended to more particularly point out that the claimed test contactor is *for mounting a device under test (DUT) on a test printed circuit board (PCB) for testing of the DUT.*

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2d Paragraph

Claims 2-6 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they fully comply with the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to points raised in the Office action, *e.g.* those concerning the preamble of independent claim 2. In particular, claim 2 has now been amended to more particularly point out that the claimed test contactor is "for mounting a device under test (DUT) on a test printed circuit board (PCB) for testing of the DUT." It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, of claim 2 has been obviated, and should be withdrawn. As claims 3-6 and 28 depend from claim 2, the corresponding rejections of these claims should also be withdrawn..

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-6 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,782,289 to Schwar et al. (Schwar).

Claim 2 recites in pertinent part:

a conductive probe having a tip contacted with the electrode pad of the DUT

Schwar neither discloses nor suggests *a conductive probe having a tip contacted with the electrode pad of the DUT.* Rather, Schwar discloses compressible pins 23 that connect to contact points 72 on the underside of testing board 30. In fact, in the device of Schwar, the DUT, integrated circuit chip 62, is mounted on the top side of testing board 30, so that it is physically impossible for any of pins 23 to be contacted with an electrode pad of the DUT. *See* Schwar, col. 5, lines 12-19 and Figs. 1-3.

Accordingly, Schwar fails to disclose each and every element of claim 2. Thus, the rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn. As claims 3-6 and 28 depend from claim 2, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn, for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

It is believed claims 2-6 and 28 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner not agree with any of Applicant's positions or arguments herein, a telephonic or personal interview is respectfully requested to discuss and resolve any remaining issues.

No fee is believed due for this submission. However, please any fee that may be due to Jones Day Deposit Account No. 50-1013.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 22, 2006


By Lawrence R. Gabuzda (Reg. No. 51,711)
For Brian M. Rothery (Reg. No. 35,340)
JONES DAY
222 East 41st Street
New York, New York 10017
(212) 326-3939